

REMARKS

The foregoing Amendment and remarks which follow are responsive to the Final Office Action mailed September 30, 2005 in relation to the above-identified patent application. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-14 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by the Mathews et al. reference. Additionally, the Examiner rejected Claims 4 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of the Mathews et al. and Sugihara et al. references, and rejected Claim 10 under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of the Mathews et al. and Okabe et al. references. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 13-15. More particularly, independent Claim 1 has been amended to describe the non-conductive film layer as defining a peripheral edge, and the package body as being disposed on the film layer and extending to the peripheral edge thereof. Independent Claim 13 has been amended to describe the substrate as comprising a plurality of transmission line elements disposed on the top film surface of the non-conductive film layer. Claims 14 and 15 have each been amended only to make the language thereof consistent to that of underlying Claim 13.

Independent Claim 1 as Amended is not Anticipated by the Mathews et al Reference

Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by the Mathews et al. reference. As is most readily apparent from Figure 2 thereof, the Mathews et al. reference discloses a transceiver package 100 having a substrate 102. Attached to the upper surface 102U of the substrate 102 is an electronic component 104. Additionally, formed on the upper surface 102U is a plurality of electrically conductive upper traces 110. Bond pads 108 of the electronic component 104 are electrically connected to the upper traces 110 by conductive bond wires 112. Also formed on the upper surface 102U is an antenna trace 136, a portion of which is covered by a dielectric layer 138. In the transceiver package 100, the electronic component 104 and bond wires 112 are protected by a glob top encapsulant 140. In addition to covering the electronic component 104 and bond wires 102, the encapsulant 140 appears to cover a portion of the upper traces 110 and a

portion of the upper surface 102U of the substrate 102. The encapsulant 140 is in turn covered by an antenna shield assembly 150 including a shield 152, a dielectric cap 154, an antenna 156, and an antenna strap 158. When the antenna shield assembly 150 is mounted to the substrate 102 in the manner shown in Figure 2, the antenna 156 is placed into electrical communication with the antenna trace 136 by the antenna strap 158.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Mathews et al reference does not teach, suggest or show the encapsulant 140, equated by the Examiner to the package body recited in Claim 1, as extending to the peripheral edge or side 102S of the substrate 102, thus covering the upper traces 110, antenna trace 136 and upper surface 102U in their entirety. In contrast, the package body recited in amended Claim 1, by virtue of extending to the peripheral edge of the film layer, completely covers the semiconductor die, the upper leads, the transmission line element, and the top film surface of the film layer. Such a configuration would be impractical in the context of the transceiver package 100 described in the Mathews et al. reference since the absence of any encapsulant cover on certain elements of the transceiver package 100 is desirable to achieve various signal routing functions. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 1 as amended is in condition for allowance, as are Claims 2-12 as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Independent Claim 13 as Amended is not Anticipated by the Mathews et al Reference

Referring now to independent Claim 13, as indicated above, the amended version of Claim 13 recites a *plurality* of transmission line elements disposed on the top film surface of the film layer. Applicant respectfully submits that the Mathews et al. reference does not teach or suggest the inclusion of a plurality of transmission line elements disposed on the upper surface 102U of the substrate 102. Even assuming, arguendo, that the antenna trace 136 constitutes a transmission line element, there is no teaching or suggestion in the Mathews et al. reference regarding any other transmission line element being disposed on the upper surface 102U of the substrate 102 in addition to such antenna trace 136. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 13 as amended is in condition for allowance, as are Claims 14-20 as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

On the basis of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the stated grounds of rejection have been overcome, and that Claims 1-20 are now in condition for allowance. Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that the present Amendment does not introduce new issues which would require further searching on the part of the Examiner, and therefore respectfully requests that the same be considered and entered by the Examiner. An early Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 19-4330.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/17/05

By:



Customer No.: 007663

Mark B. Garred
Registration No. 34,823
STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER
75 Enterprise, Suite 250
Aliso Viejo, California 92656
Telephone: (949) 855-1246
Fax: (949) 855-6371